



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO **MANAGER'S REPORT**

DATE ISSUED: June 9, 2005 REPORT NO. 05-145

ATTENTION: Land Use and Housing Committee
Docket of June 15, 2005

SUBJECT: Proposed Revisions to Council Policy 600-24

REFERENCE: Manager's Report 04-241, dated November 3, 2004

SUMMARY

Issue – Should the Land Use and Housing Committee recommend that the City Council adopt revisions to Council Policy 600-24, *Standard Operating Procedures and Responsibilities of Recognized Community Planning Committees*, consistent with the recommendations of staff and the Community Planners Committee (CPC)?

Manager's Recommendation – Recommend revisions to Council Policy 600-24 as proposed in this report.

Other Recommendations – On March 22, 2005, the CPC voted 15-2-1 to support the revisions to Council Policy 600-24 as developed by the CPC subcommittee with staff.

Fiscal Impact – Increased costs of ongoing assistance to recognized community planning groups cannot be estimated at this time. Cost of providing assistance to all recognized community planning groups to revise their bylaws to come into compliance with the revised Council Policy 600-24 provisions will need to be managed as part of the Planning Department's work program, with possible delay to other program elements.

BACKGROUND

Over the past two years, a subcommittee of the CPC met with Planning Department staff to consider revisions to Council Policy 600-24, *Standard Operating Procedures and Responsibilities of Recognized Community Planning Committees*. The review had begun at the urging of the CPC chair, Dave Potter, and Planning Department management. It was determined that outdated provisions in the adopted Policy were unresponsive to current situations. Since the

Policy was last updated in 1991, many new recognized community planning groups have been formed and much experience has been gained utilizing the Policy. It was not difficult to determine that many of the Policy provisions needed revision.

The CPC subcommittee, consisting of more than a dozen planning group members, worked with staff over the two-year period to address issues raised by both planning groups and by staff. Issues were discussed, proposed language reviewed by the subcommittee, and final proposals inserted into Council Policy 600-24. The entire CPC has been actively involved in the review and comment on the Policy since October 2004, at which time CPC voted to distribute draft revisions to all recognized community planning groups for their review. The Policy and all review materials were posted on the Planning Department's website for easier access by the public at large. In early 2005, recognized community planning groups were reviewing the Policy revisions and forwarding comments to staff. On February 18, 2005, the CPC subcommittee met to review comments from all the planning groups and to make some final changes to the proposed revisions. On March 22, 2005, the CPC voted 15-2-1 to support the subcommittee's proposed revisions to Council Policy 600-24.

Attachment 1 of this report identifies the significant milestones in the two-year process.

DISCUSSION

The CPC subcommittee and Planning Department staff worked diligently to prepare proposed revisions to Council Policy 600-24 that would reflect the needs of recognized community planning groups. It was discussed that the Policy should provide a strong framework from which individual planning groups' bylaws could be developed or revised. It was recognized that planning groups had developed certain operating procedures unique to their communities' situations. The subcommittee recognized the value in groups being able to maintain individualized bylaws provisions. The subcommittee did indicate, however, that there were certain basic provisions that should be adhered to by all planning groups to assure consistent operations among the planning groups and to assure continued credibility.

The major proposed revisions to Council Policy 600-24 are categorized in the following list. The brackets indicate the sections of the Policy that were revised.

- Tying together of Council Policy 600-24, the Administrative Guidelines, and the Indemnification Ordinance [Policy section]
- Added provision regarding retaining eligibility to serve on the planning group [Article III, Section 5]
- Added investigation and dealing with allegations of noncompliance with Council Policy 600-24 and adopted bylaws by individuals and by planning group actions [Article III, Sections 6 and 7]
- Added investigation and dealing with allegations of detrimental conduct by individuals and by planning groups [Article VI, Section 1]
- Added language in certain provisions suggesting or directing planning groups to establish group-specific policies in their bylaws [Article IV, Sections 6 and 7] [Article V, Sections 1, 3, and 4]

- Clarified that voting proxies are not in the spirit of the Council policy and are not allowed [Article VI, Section 9]
- Added discussion about conducting planning group business in a public setting [Article VI, Section 10]
- Reorganized Article VIII dealing with topics that planning groups should establish individually within their bylaws
- Edited, reorganized, and updated terminology throughout the Policy

The proposed revisions to Council Policy 600-24, as approved by CPC and supported by the Planning Department, are found in Attachment 2.

It should be noted that the CPC subcommittee will continue its work with staff when it restarts its review of the Administrative Guidelines. The Administrative Guidelines, adopted in 1991 to assist in the planning groups' use of Council Policy 600-24, were updated several years ago. The CPC subcommittee and staff felt that since the Guidelines are very helpful in explaining how to use the Policy provisions in relationship to adopted bylaws, the Guidelines should be updated to reflect currently-needed direction and Policy changes. A substantial expansion and reorganization of the Guidelines is in process.

The CPC subcommittee suggested an 18-month timeframe for planning groups and staff to work together to update all recognized community planning groups' bylaws. According to the POLICY section of Council Policy 600-24, revised bylaws may be approved by the Planning Director and City Attorney where a planning group's bylaws are more detailed than the Policy provisions but are entirely consistent with the Policy's intent (e.g., defining membership categories or creating election procedures). However, if a bylaw provision is inconsistent with the minimum standards and operating procedures of the Policy and a planning group wants to retain that particular provision, the planning group would have to ask that the City Council approve their bylaws containing the provision that is inconsistent with the Policy.

CONCLUSION

Revisions to Council Policy 600-24, supported by the CPC and by staff, are before the Land Use and Housing Committee for approval. After the City Council adopts the changes to the Policy, staff will work with the City's recognized community planning groups to revise their bylaws, as necessary, to comply with the revised Policy provisions.

Respectfully submitted,

S. Gail Goldberg, AICP
Planning Director

Approved: Ellen Oppenheim
Deputy City Manager

OPPENHEIM/SGG/BAM/ah

Attachment 1: [Milestones in Current Revision Effort of Council Policy 600-24](#)
Attachment 2: [Proposed Revisions to Council Policy 600-24 dated 2/28/05](#)